

From: Louis Pratola
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9 59 AM
Subject: media monopolies

Do not relax broadcast rules Media grants are already censoring viewpoints by rejecting paid time If anything, rules should be strengthened to provide a more balanced view Louis G Pratola Toms River NJ

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Dennis & Sheila Brogger
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:59 AM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

I am writing to urge you to leave the current broadcast ownership rules as they are, do not change them! They were adopted to keep organizations from acquiring a monopoly on the news and editorials throughout a region/state/or the country. They have served us well for a long time. If you change the rules, as requested by some of the media giants, the democratic and political process in this country would suffer. Whole communities, states, or an entire region could be dominated by one large media conglomerate, which would decide what viewpoints to allow on the air and what to censor. Some of these companies (Viacom/CBS, Disney/ABC) have already used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air, and the proposed changes would give these companies even greater power.

If representative democracy and constitutional government is to survive in the United States, it is essential that all issues be thoroughly debated and opposing viewpoints equally and fairly presented. If that happens, I have total faith that the American people will come up with the answer to our problems. We, the people, do not need to be dictated to by self-serving elitist national news organization(s), have the news edited to what is politically correct, and to have only one side of an issue presented. We want fairness, which we do not get from the big media conglomerates. Instead, I believe that they now have too much power, and would propose that that power be reigned in. They should be broken up into smaller units. They should be required to accept paid political advertisements and messages whether they agree with the message or not. They should be required to offer free time to opposing viewpoints whenever they offer free time to proponents of a viewpoint that they support.

Think about our history! What would have happened in the 1770s if all the newspapers had been controlled by one or two corporations owned and controlled by Loyalists or the English King? The American Revolution would not have happened.

If you change the rules, the concept of George Orwell's "1984" may not be too far off, with all news and political opinion censored to what is "politically correct" by one or two conglomerates rather than an all-pervasive government. That government and conglomerate would however be totally tied together, because the conglomerates would control the political debate and in effect, the government.

Thank You for allowing me to share my comments and opinions!

Dennis A Brogger

From: Louis Pratola
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9 59 AM
Subject: media monopolies

Do not relax broadcast rules Media giants are already censoring viewpoints by rejecting paid time If anything, rules should be strengthened to provide a more balanced view Louis G Pratola Toms River NJ

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Robert Krikorian
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10 02 AM
Subject: Please stop action at the June Board Meeting

Please reschedule implementation and acceptance of historic FCC changes from your June meeting to a future meeting I agree that much more discussion needs to take place and hearings held

Bob K

From: A Young
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10 29 AM
Subject: Healthy Free Speech

To Honorable Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Commissioner

I urge you to not relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect me and all the other American citizens from media monopolies. A free press protects us all and a monopolized press is not free.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total or total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a well known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. In particular many of these conglomerates have tried in the past to keep our common viewpoints off the air or edited by an editorial staff with political limitations. The local communities across the country should decide which viewpoints to allow on the air by simply switching the channel and promoting those advertisers who support the media outlet they support.

The American people deserve to hear more than one or two points of view on not just important issues, but any issue. Therefore, for the sake of our democratic republic and our many freedoms I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections, that for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country and consequently have helped ensure a healthy country.

Sincerely,

Andrew F Young

Andrew F Young, Esq. Intellectual Property Law
115 Orchid St., Floral Park, NY 11001
Phone/Fax 516-775-0068, Cellular 516-770-2248
Important Notice: This communication is privileged and confidential and is intended solely for the recipient or their agent.
Should this communication be received in error, please retain in confidence and contact the above for immediate retrieval.

From: Richard Sonnenschein
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10 31 AM
Subject: media monopoly

Richard L. Sonnenschein
P O Box 3121
Poughkeepsie, NY 12603
Tel (845)452-7486

May 3, 2003

The Honorable Michael Copps, Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D C

Dear Mr. Copps

The fact that the vast majority of American citizens are dangerously unaware that monopolies in Media pose a threat to democracy, is itself proof that to permit a few power brokers (in corporate/free enterprise guise) to essentially control all production/transmission/delivery/distribution capabilities and technologies is not in the public interest

News media has not reported this issue responsibly and objectively, denying millions of American citizens like myself the opportunity to hear arguments and come down on a side. This is the information age, and we citizens must be informed objectively by the media, in order to form opinions they can then voice to legislators

I happen to have first heard about the issue on NOW, the kind of journalism we Americans need more of

Please let me know, Commissioner, what the average American can do at this late stage, to demand that the decision on the issue be delayed?

Thank you for your efforts

Sincerely,

Richard Sonnenschein

Do you Yahoo!?

The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo

[http //search yahoo com](http://search.yahoo.com)

From: ROBERT S ROY
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10 50 AM
Subject: Increased Concentration of Media Ownership

To Chairman Michael K Powell

I am urging you to OPPOSE lifting the rules of ownership concentration by media companies. I feel that it is your responsibility to guarantee a fair and even flow of information by media to the citizens of the US. This can only be done by limiting concentration of ownership, which allows competition to flourish.

Sincerely,

R Scott and Linda S Roy

From: Bob Vesely
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10 57 AM
Subject: I opposed the proposed media ownership changes

Dear FCC Commissioners

I would like to add my voice in opposition to the FCC's proposal of media ownership changes. I have been in broadcasting nearly 30 years and ever since the deregulation in 1996, the industry has gone downhill in reporting fairness, local ownership, and employee equity. Please don't loosen the regulations and consolidate the media any further. This is not about big corporate economics, its about freedom, diversity, and the opportunity for the public to be heard.

Please consider that the 1996 telecommunication changes were a failure and tighten the regulations in market and cross ownership, not ease them. In the last ten years it has become nearly impossible for local media owners to compete against the titans in broadcasting. Giving the small business person an opportunity to once again gain control of local media outlets would create jobs and give the citizens local reporting that has been lacking.

Some call the Communications act of 1934 antiquated, I don't believe that any more than the U S Constitution is worthless.

Sincerely,

Bob Vesely
Seattle, WA

CC: senator_murray@murray.senate.gov

From: bruce winters
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11 02 AM
Subject: FCC broadcast ownership rules

May 3, 2003

The Honorable Michael J. Copps,

If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations

Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor

The big media corporations have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC- are precisely the same companies that have tried in the past to keep your viewpoints off the air

Bruce Winters
59 Northumberland Dr
Toms River, N J
08757

MSN 8 helps eliminate e-mail viruses. Get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: Tqeagle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:23 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I do not feel any Origination should have control of any one item or items. That, in my book, creates a monopoly and should not be.

So, I urge you, please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules. I have also summated postcards to that effect.

Raymond W. Howell

From: Tqeagle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:23 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I do not feel any Origination should have control of any one item or items That, in my book, creates a monopoly and should not be

So, I urge you, please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules I have also summated postcards to that effect

Raymond W Howell

From: Stan C
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:31 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Chairman/Commissioner

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Stanley Coleman
Manhasset, New York 11030-1706

From: Tqeagle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:35 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I do not feel any Origination should have control of any one item or items That , in my book, creates a monopoly and should not be

So, I urge you, please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules I have also summated postcards to that effect

Raymond W Howell

From: Tqeagle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:35 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I do not feel any Origination should have control of any one item or items. That, in my book, creates a monopoly and should not be.

So, I urge you, please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules. I have also summated postcards to that effect.

Raymond W. Howell

From: klmahler@yahoo.com
To: mpowel@fcc.gov
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:36 AM
Subject: Changing limits on media outlet holdings

TO: mpowel@fcc.gov
FROM: Ken and Rhoda Mahler
DATE: 05/03/03
SUBJECT: Removing limitations on media ownership
CC: kabernat@fcc.gov, mcopps@fcc.gov, kjmweb@fcc.gov, jadelst@fcc.gov

Dear Mr. Powell

As two concerned citizens and voters, we urge you to postpone any action on increasing the share of media slots for individual owners until some significant public debate has taken place.

The airwaves are the property of the people, and the people should be consulted in open hearings in a deliberate and highly publicized fashion. There surely ought to be congressional hearings on the matter at the very least.

Any further monopolizing of media outlets by a few powerful interests threatens to limit public access to diversified ideas and opinion, and thereby constitutes serious danger to the free flow of information so essential to our democracy. To wit, an outrage.

Sincerely,

Ken and Rhoda Mahler
Very concerned citizens in Florida

Hard copies to: Rep. Adam Putnam, Sen. Graham, Sen. Nelson

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: klmahler@yahoo.com
To: mpowel@fcc.gov
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:36 AM
Subject: Changing limits on media outlet holdings

TO: mpowel@fcc.gov
FROM: Ken and Rhoda Mahler
DATE: 05/03/03
SUBJECT: Removing limitations on media ownership
CC: kabernat@fcc.gov, mcopps@fcc.gov, kjmweb@fcc.gov,
jadelst@fcc.gov

Dear Mr. Powell

As two concerned citizens and voters, we urge you to postpone any action on increasing the share of media slots for individual owners until some significant public debate has taken place.

The airwaves are the property of the people, and the people should be consulted in open hearings in a deliberate and highly publicized fashion. There surely ought to be congressional hearings on the matter at the very least.

Any further monopolizing of media outlets by a few powerful interests threatens to limit public access to diversified ideas and opinion, and thereby constitutes serious danger to the free flow of information so essential to our democracy. To whit, an outrage.

Sincerely,

Ken and Rhoda Mahler
Very concerned citizens in Florida

Hard copies to: Rep. Adam Putnam, Sen. Graham, Sen. Nelson

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Diane Sheehy
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:42 AM
Subject: June vote on ownership

Sir, I am writing in regard to the vote you have called for in June to rewrite the ownership rules, as I understand the challenge before your committee, allowing one person or group to control newspapers, radio and tv in one area, is this not a monopoly? we are already hearing the results on the radio with Clear Channel (I think it is called) I am aware we are now receiving information based on what party lines the radio or tv stations or behind. Why would you put even more control into the hands of a few?? Isn't your job to serve the public to their best interest? I am very concerned you will be swayed by the immense pressure from the lobbyists who have the money to come Washington. I ask you to remember-they are not the public- of course you know this, I just want you to understand just because we, who are not within the "beltway" nor on any list really are concerned about what you are doing "within the beltway". Take more time to look and study the issues. Do not make policy in haste, we the people will have to live with your decisions, please make them wisely. Sincerely Diane Sheehy Salt Lake City, Ut

From: Christel Cherry
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:43 AM
Subject: Keep the Media Free - Vote against consolidation and deregulation

Please keep our media competition intact. The public owns the airwaves - not the media giants. Protect our freedom. True Democracy needs full reporting. Leave a legacy of Integrity not cowardliness.

Christel Cherry,
11634 C NE 70th PL
Kirkland, WA 98033

From: Diane Sheehy
To: Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 11:49 AM
Subject: june vote

Sir and Madame, I am writing in regard to the vote you have called for in June to rewrite the ownership rules, as I understand the challenge before your committee, allowing one person or group to control newspapers, radio and

tv in one area, is this not a monopoly? we are already hearing the results on the radio with Clear Channel (I think it is called) I am aware we are now receiving information based on what party lines the radio or tv stations are supporting I would like to be able to hear alternative news and ideas without turning to the BBC Why would you put even more control into the hands of a few?? Isn't your job to serve the public to their best interest? I am very concerned you will be swayed by the immense pressure

from the lobbyists who have the money to come Washington I ask you to remember they are not the public- of course you know this ,I just want you to understand just because we,who are not within the "beltway" nor on any list really are concerned about what you are doing "within the beltway" Take more time to look and study the issues Do not make policy in haste, we the people will have to live with your decisions, please make them wisely Sincerely Diane Sheehy Salt Lake City,Ut

From: carl smith
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12 00 PM
Subject: FW Media Concentration

From: carl smith <carlandjoan@cox-internet.com>
Date: Sat, 03 May 2003 10:52:09 -0400
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>
Subject: Media Concentration

We object to the further concentration of media control. The public must be protected as to localism, competition and diversity of the media. Never should more than 35% control be under one corporation. The public must be served not the "bottom line" of an industry. The democracy must be preserved which means the government is of the people, by the people and for the people. Take more time for input meetings and do not make a quick decision in June. This is far too important to the country as a whole than to let only those in Washington decide. The American people deserve more respect than it seems you are giving them in this democratic government.

Carl and Joan Smith

CC: KM KJMWEB

From: John Chandler
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12 14 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

I would live to voice my opinion on the up coming review by the FCC I am very, very worried about the talks to let fewer and fewer companies take charge of the media This could be the largest mistake taken by a government office Imagine a time that one company owns 90% of all media outlets The CEO has a negative point of view of the sitting Presidential administration, that has just asked for air time to talk about his agenda That CEO turns him down and continues with his regular programing This is not a service to the people We, the people, own the air waves The voice and news of the nation will be controlled by a few That few will be able to shape and distort the news to fit the needs or there agendas Please DO NOT change the current regulations

Kindest regards, John Chandler

From: Rod Rose
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12 28 PM
Subject: Monopoly media ownership

Dear Mr. Copps,

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely
Roderick S. Rose
137 Lookout Pass
Stormville, NY 12582

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

From: derig
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:44 PM
Subject: Media Takeover

Dear Mr. Copps

We saw your interview with Bill Moyer last night. We've been watching the media takeover for some time. The media is being controlled by a few

The situation is dangerous and shows a drift toward the old state-run propaganda machines of those we have called, in past times, our enemies--Nazis, Stalinists, etc.

The air waves belong to the citizens, as you said during the interview. We back you 100%. What more can we do to convince the "deciders" before the deadline of June 2nd arrives? Your suggestions will be of great help.

How can we "vote" on this matter other than telling you our views? Please let us know. OUR air waves are in danger of being used for purposes they were not intended. Thanks for the information!!!

Gene and Marilyn Derig
derig@fidalgo.net

From: Ray Hockedy
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:51 PM
Subject: Please No Centralized Media

Mr. Powell

I am writing you because of my concern about upcoming FCC action which may allow more centralization of media in geographic areas. This is clearly wrong and will lead to monopolies of ideas and a virtual censorship of thought in our great nation. Please do all in your power to assure that we maintain a wide spectrum of ownership and operation of the media licensed by the FCC. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Raymond S. Hockedy

From: Ray Hockedy
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:51 PM
Subject: No to Media Centralization

Ms Abernathy

I am writing you because of my concern about upcoming FCC action which may allow more centralization of media in geographic areas. This is clearly wrong and will lead to monopolies of ideas and a virtual censorship of thought in our great nation. Please do all in your power to assure that we maintain a wide spectrum of ownership and operation of the media licensed by the FCC. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Raymond S. Hockedy

From: Wren Osborn
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:51 PM
Subject: Proposed changes in monopolization rules

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I am very concerned about the lack of diligence of the FCC in informing the American public about possible changes that will result in more monopolization of TV media and monopolization of all media in select markets. I understand June 2 will be the date of decision making. Very few official hearings have been held.

I am letting you know I am against further monopolization of media.

Please remember the airwaves belong to the people and should be used to promote democracy, not strangle it. Monopolization has many negative affects for democracy. It tends to limit controversy and the presentation of diversified views. Also, the bottom line becomes more important than journalistic standards.

Sincerely,

Wren Osborn (Mrs.)
1151 Pine Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020
wrenosborn@cox.net
619-440-4179

From: Ray Hockedy
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:52 PM
Subject: No to Media Centralization

Mr. Copps

I am writing you because of my concern about upcoming FCC action which may allow more centralization of media in geographic areas. This is clearly wrong and will lead to monopolies of ideas and a virtual censorship of thought in our great nation. Please do all in your power to assure that we maintain a wide spectrum of ownership and operation of the media licensed by the FCC. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Raymond S. Hockedy

From: Sarah Quinn
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:58 PM
Subject: FCC deregulation of media ownership[

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I am OPPOSED to the further deregulation of the media ownership of the airways being voted on June 2, 2003 by the FCC. There have not been enough public hearings and comment on this deregulation or study on the long term implications and effects of this proposed change.

I urge you to oppose this deregulation until there has been time for more public hearings and study of the long term implications of these changes.

In my view, there is already too much concentration of media in the hands of a few companies. I believe this limits the scope of information and neutrality of news coverage. To allow it to be further concentrated in the hands and bias of a few companies is not in the interest of the public good. And after all, THE AIRWAYS BELONG TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, not a few companies. Further, I believe the deregulation will concentrate news coverage and information to the lowest common denominator and will further erode local coverage. There needs to be thoughtful, serious oversight of media in order to insure the interests of the public are being protected.

Sincerely,

Sarah Emma Quinn
715 30th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144

From: Sara Baldwin
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:59 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC changes

Dear Ms Abernathy

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the changes the FCC is considering that would deregulate media ownership-limits in local markets. This change would result in fewer media companies and thus a higher concentration of media control in the hands of a few large corporations.

I teach English as a Second Language at a community college in Seattle. One of my subjects is Citizenship. I teach new immigrants and refugee adults about our country and its democratic form of government. We study the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I tell my students that our democracy is based on a free press, and that a FREE press represents a wide variety of viewpoints. This includes a widely diverse LOCAL perspective. This Diversity of local perspectives would be lost if the critical safeguards that are designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership are ended under the FCC plans. Under these plans, there would be fewer owners of networks, TV and radio stations, and newspapers which would lessen the variety of viewpoints in our media.

I attended the FCC hearing at the University of Washington on March 7, 2003 and listened to the many people testifying about these proposed changes. It was clear from the audience reactions that most of them were very much against these proposals. However, it doesn't appear as if the audience's opinions are being taken into consideration even though most of them signed postcards and petitions opposing these changes. Why are opinions being solicited at such hearings if they are not being considered?

At this hearing, I learned many facts that support my opposition to these proposed changes, including the fact that after the last deregulation, Los Angeles ended up with NO locally owned TV stations or newspapers. Surely this is not helping the citizens of Los Angeles make informed decisions about their city, environment or the laws that govern them.

It is clear that we need MORE locally owned TV & radio stations and newspapers to protect and ensure our democracy in the United States. Thank you for considering my opinions in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Sara Baldwin
6317 Linden Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo
[http //search yahoo com](http://search.yahoo.com)